

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claim invention as stated in the office action was directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal et al., US Patent No. 6,324,533 and Martin, US Patent No. 6,704,743. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants further submit that no new matter was introduced in the amendment to the claims.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Jean Corrielus participated in a telephonic interview on June 27, 2007 to discuss the independent claims in relation to the cited references. Agreement was reached with respect to the above claim amendments.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-18 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention was stated to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 1 is hereby amended to recite a method comprising organizing a data store, which is statutory subject matter. Furthermore, new independent claim 25 recites a computer readable storage medium corresponding to this method, which is also statutory subject matter. Additionally, new independent claim 32 recites a system including hardware components such as a processor and memory, which is also statutory subject matter. Given the above, it is believed that claims 1-9 and 25-38 are in condition to overcome the noted rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal et al. U.S. patent no. 6,324,533 and Martin U.S. Patent no. 6,704,743

Independent claims 1, 25 and 32 recite a data store comprising at least one of an Item, an Element, and a Relationship, a Base Schema that establishes a framework for creating and

organizing the Item and a Core Schema that defines a set of core types, wherein each Item is characterized into at least one core type based on the Item type or the Item subtype, the characterizations being stored in the data store for organizing and searching data.

Unlike that which is recited in claims 1, 25 and 32 of the present application, the cited Agrawal et al. reference is directed to the mining data relationships from a database with frequent itemsets being generated using a group-by query with rules being extracted from the union of the frequent itemsets. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Agrawal et al. does not disclose a Core Schema as recited in applicants' claims. The cited Martin reference teaches the selective inheritance of object parameters, with the seeding of basic entities to support the object inheritance. Feature definition entities such as "parent" relationship, a "should inherit" attribute, a "back link" relationship, etc. are also used to provide added functionality. The cited references taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest the following limitation from independent claims 1, 25 and 32:

a Base Schema that establishes a framework for creating and organizing the at least one Item; and a Core Schema that defines a set of core types, wherein each Item is characterized into at least one core type based on the Item type or the Item subtype, the characterizations being stored in the data store

Furthermore, Applicants cannot find any teaching or motivation in the cited references as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the data-mining system of Agrawal et al. that uses mining relationships using group-by query with the data seeding of basic entities to support object inheritance as taught in the cited Martin reference. The purpose of minimizing the performance impact of changes to the structure of the parent entities as mentioned in the office action, seems not to be appropriate motivation to combine the references for one of ordinary skill in the art given the major differences between the data mining system of Agrawal et al. and the selective inheritance of object parameters taught in Martin.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 25 and 32 are not rendered obvious by the combination of the cited Agrawal et al. and Martin references. Applicants further submit that claims 2-9, 26-31 and 33-38 are patentable because they recite further nonobvious limitations and for reason of their dependency. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 305642.01 / MSFT-2735
Application No.: 10/646,580
Office Action Dated: March 21, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: July 23, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439